

**APR 17 2006**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

ANA LILIA PANTOJA-ADAME,

Petitioner,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-74503

Agency No. A79-789-494

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted April 13, 2006\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, McKEOWN and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Ana Lilia Pantoja-Adame, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") order denying her application for cancellation

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

of removal. To the extent we have jurisdiction, it is conferred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review questions of law de novo, *see Cabrera-Alvarez v. Gonzales*, 423 F.3d 1006, 1009 (9th Cir. 2005), and we dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency's discretionary determination that Pantoja-Adame failed to establish exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i); *Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005).

Pantoja-Adame's argument that the IJ applied the wrong legal standard in determining hardship fails because the IJ's interpretation of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" falls well within the broad range authorized by the statutory language. *See Ramirez-Perez v. Ashcroft*, 336 F.3d 1001, 1004- 06 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**